



**PATENT**

Case Docket No. ETINC.012A

Date: April 22, 2005

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s) : Amit Patel et al.  
Appl. No. : 09/827,030  
Filed : April 5, 2001  
For : CLIENT INSTALLATION AND  
EXECUTION SYSTEM FOR  
STREAMED APPLICATIONS  
Group Art Unit : 2124  
Class/Sub-Class : 717-178000  
Examiner : Trenton J. Roche

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all marked attachments are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

4/22/05  
(Date)

John R. King  
John R. King, Reg. No. 34,362

**TRANSMITTAL LETTER**

**MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE**  
**Commissioner for Patents**  
**P.O. Box 1450**  
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Dear Sir:

Enclosed for filing is the Issue Fee for the above-identified application:

- (X) Form PTOL-85.
- (X) Comments on Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in three (3) pages.
- (X) A check in the amount of \$1730 to cover the issue fee, publication fee, and advanced order of copies.
- (X) Return prepaid postcard.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.

John R. King

John R. King  
Registration No. 34,362  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Amit Patel, et al.  
Appl. No. : 09/827,030  
Filed : April 5, 2001  
For : CLIENT INSTALLATION AND  
EXECUTION SYSTEM FOR  
STREAMED APPLICATIONS  
Examiner : Trenton J. Roche  
Group Art Unit : 2124

**COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Notice of Allowance mailed January 26, 2005. In the Statement of Reasons for Allowance accompanying the Notice of Allowance, Applicants note the following:

**Claim 1**

The Examiner states, among other things, that the reason for allowance of Claim 1 is that "Schaefer [Applicants presume the Examiner to mean U.S. Patent No. 6,374,402 to Schmeidler et al.] does not disclose at least *providing a file mapping database that persistently stores on said client a bi-directional mapping of the client file system to the streaming server file system after termination of said streamed application and providing a registry spoof database that persistently stores on said client mappings of original registry paths to new alternate registry paths after termination of said streamed application.*"

To the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of Claim 1 rests on the recitation of the above-identified features, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's Statement because it is the combination of features that makes Claim 1

**Appl. No.** : 09/827,030  
**Filed** : April 5, 2001

patentable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 of the present application is allowable because Claim 1 recites a combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

### **Claim 13**

The Examiner indicates that the reason for allowance of Claim 13 is similar to the reason for allowance of Claim 1.

To the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of Claim 13 rests on the recitation of the above-identified features, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's Statement because it is the combination of features that makes Claim 13 patentable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 13 of the present application is allowable because Claim 13 recites a combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

### **Claim 25**

The Examiner indicates that the reason for allowance of Claim 25 is similar to the reason for allowance of Claim 1.

To the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of Claim 25 rests on the recitation of the above-identified features, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's Statement because it is the combination of features that makes Claim 25 patentable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 25 of the present application is allowable because Claim 25 recites a combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

### **Claim 37**

The Examiner indicates that the reason for allowance of Claim 37 is similar to the reason for allowance of Claim 1.

To the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of Claim 37 rests on the recitation of the above-identified features, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's Statement because it is the combination of features that makes Claim 37 patentable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 37 of the present application is allowable because Claim 37 recites a combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Appl. No. : 09/827,030  
Filed : April 5, 2001

**Claim 47**

The Examiner indicates that the reason for allowance of Claim 47 is similar to the reason for allowance of Claim 1.

To the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of Claim 47 rests on the recitation of the above-identified features, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's Statement because it is the combination of features that makes Claim 47 patentable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 47 of the present application is allowable because Claim 47 recites a combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

**Claim 57**

The Examiner indicates that the reason for allowance of Claim 57 is similar to the reason for allowance of Claim 1.

To the extent that there is any implication that the patentability of Claim 57 rests on the recitation of the above-identified features, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's Statement because it is the combination of features that makes Claim 57 patentable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 57 of the present application is allowable because Claim 57 recites a combination of features that is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/22/05

By: John R. King  
John R. King  
Registration No. 34,362  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404